

**REMARKS**

This is in response to the Final Office Action mailed January 9, 2007. Claims 1 and 11 are amended, example support for the amendments being found at least on page 14, lines 20-29 of the present application. Claims 1-3, 6, and 11-13 remain pending. Reconsideration and allowance are requested for the following reasons.

***I. Rejection of Claims the Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)***

In section 5 of the Office Action, Claims 1-3 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,892,512 (“Donnelly”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,008,806 (“Nakajima”) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,429,882 (“Abdelnur”). This rejection is respectfully traversed, and reconsideration is requested for the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites automatically building a menu based on the interface binding, wherein automatically building the menu comprises the processor being programmed to, upon subsequent generation of the menu, include additional commanding information added to a control level without requiring changes to be made to a plurality of different applications, wherein the commanding information is provided by control elements that are common among the plurality of applications, and include at least a core set of commands provided by the control elements.

As stated in the Office Action, both Donnelly and Nakajima fail to disclose including additional commanding information. See Office Action page 4, lines 1-2. Since Donnelly and Nakajima do not disclose including commanding information, both also necessarily fail to disclose automatically building a command interface including additional commanding information provided by control elements that are common among applications, and including at least a core set of commands provided by the control elements, as recited by Claim 1.

Abdelnur does not overcome these deficiencies of Donnelly and Nakajima. Abdelnur discloses searching a properties file to automatically populate binding information for an action bar, menu bar, and tool bar. Col. 13, lines 3-15; Fig. 5. The properties files is simply an ASCII-format file stored in a file system. Col. 11, lines 1-6 and 19-21.

Abdelnur fails to suggest that the properties file is implemented at a control level, as required by claim 1. For example, the Application describes the control level as the level that is logically positioned between the operating system level and application level and includes control elements that are implemented at the control level, such as those shown in Figure 3.

Application, p. 6, lines 4-11. There is no suggestion that the properties file disclosed by Abdelnur is implemented at the control level.

In addition, Abdelnur fails to suggest that the binding information in the properties file can be shared among applications. As such, Abdelnur fails to disclose automatically building a command interface including additional commanding information provided by control elements that are common among applications, and including a core set of commands provided by the control elements, as recited by claim 1. Rather, Abdelnur is silent regarding including a core set of commands from commanding information provided by control elements.

During the telephonic interview occurring on March 7, 2008, the Examiner directed Applicants to Abdelnur at column 15, lines 5-21 to indicate that Abdelnur may disclose the subject matter of Claims 1 and 11. Applicants respectfully disagree. Abdelnur discloses the common look and feel of GUIs may be easily modified. Col. 15, lines 6 and 7. To easily modify the look and feel, an editor and commands may be subclasses or implementations of a container class that specifies the graphical characteristics of the GUI. Col. 15, lines 8-11 For example, in Abdelnur, a container may provide for specific positioning of a menu bar, tool bar, and action bar and the utilization of certain fonts, colors, or shading for the bars. Col. 15, lines 11-14. Thus, Abdelnur uses the same container across different applications and business objects, and the applications and business objects will have the same look and feel. Col. 15, lines 15-17. As such, Abdelnur fails to disclose automatically building a command interface including additional commanding information provided by control elements that are common among applications, and including a core set of commands provided by the control elements, as recited by claim 1. Rather, Abdelnur is silent regarding including a core set of commands from commanding information provided by control elements and merely discloses using container classes to specify a GUI's look and graphical characteristics.

Consequently, combining Donnelly with Nakajima and Abdelnur would not have led to the claimed inventions because Donnelly, Nakajima, and Abdelnur, individually and in combination, at least do not disclose or suggest automatically build a menu based on the interface binding, wherein automatically building the menu comprises the processor being programmed to, upon subsequent generation of the menu, include additional commanding information added to a control level without requiring changes to be made to a plurality of different applications, wherein the commanding information is provided by control elements that

are common among the plurality of applications, and include at least a core set of commands provided by the control elements, as recited by Claim 1.

In section 6, Claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Donnelly in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,262,729 (“Marcos”). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Marcos is cited solely for disclosing that data can be retrieved from a database to dynamically generate a web application. Although the correctness of this characterization is not conceded, Marcos does not overcome the above-noted deficiencies of Donnelly, Nakajima, and Abdelnur because Marcos fails to disclose or suggest automatically building a command interface including additional commanding information provided by control elements that are common among applications, and including a core set of commands provided by the control elements, as recited by claim 11.

In section 7, Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Donnelly in view of Marcos and further in view of Nakajima. This rejection is respectfully traversed, and reconsideration is requested for the following reasons. Claim 13 depends from claim 11 and is therefore patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 11 provided above.

Accordingly, independent Claims 1 and 11 are patentably distinguishable over the cited art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claims 1 and 11. Dependent Claims 2, 3, 6, 12, and 13 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claims 1 and 11, and by virtue of their respective dependencies upon independent Claims 1 and 11. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 2, 3, 6, 12, and 13.

## ***II. Conclusion***

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending Claims. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Final Office Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the Claimed inventions that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Final Office Action. The Claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability. Furthermore, the Final Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art

and the Claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Final Office Action.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,  
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.  
P.O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903  
(612) 332-5300

Date: March 21, 2008

/Robert A. Kalinsky/  
Name: Robert A. Kalinsky  
Reg. No.: 50,471